

of Fort Scott, about 40 miles away. It was an old Indian fort early on. Then it was used, obviously, as well, during the Civil War.

In a concession to make space for veterans wanting to be buried at the Fort Scott National Cemetery, burial spots are currently being made smaller, and sloping land that originally was deemed unusable is now being used.

Thanks to the extraordinary efforts of these veterans I have mentioned, these 13 veterans, working as the Fort Scott National Cemetery Expansion Committee, 10 acres of land will be added to the cemetery. This land, just across the old stone wall from the cemetery, was purchased by the 13 veterans, who took out a loan, and who then sought contributions and worked the crowds at American Legion and VFW halls throughout the region to raise money to pay off the loan. Once the loan was paid off, the veterans donated the land to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

On Veterans Day, this year, November 12, 2001, this land will be dedicated and ready to handle about 3,300 burial sites. I applaud the initiative of these Fort Scott veterans who have successfully undertaken the effort to expand this historic cemetery and provide a place of honor for veterans and their eligible dependents for several decades to come.

I point this out because Fort Scott National Cemetery is one of the oldest veterans cemeteries in the country, dedicated by Abraham Lincoln. It is filled up—or soon will be full. These veterans, by their own initiative, secured the loan, purchased the land, got the loan paid off, and donated it to the Department of Veterans Affairs, which is receiving the land, and now will be able to provide an additional 3,300 burial sites for veterans.

I think that this is such a commendable thing that these veterans have done. I will be there on November 12, along with a number of other people, to recognize and honor what these men have done. I think it is wholly appropriate to recognize what they have done in this body as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. TORRICELLI are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2:30 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:32 p.m., recessed until 2:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MILLER).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are now 20 minutes of debate evenly divided on the Hutchison amendment. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I understood it was 30 minutes equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I suggest the Senator from Connecticut be recognized—and this has been cleared on both sides—as in morning business for 7 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 7 minutes.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, so there is no misunderstanding, I have spoken with Senator LANDRIEU and Senator HUTCHISON, and the unanimous consent request Senator LANDRIEU made takes 3½ minutes off each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to use 5 minutes and be informed at the end of 5 minutes so Senator DURBIN may take the floor, and I would like to reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be notified.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, my amendment attempts to be a compromise between those who wish to take the caps off the attorney's fees for suing the District of Columbia School District and what I think is a quite reasonable approach, which is to keep the caps but raise them.

For the last 3 years, we have had caps on attorney's fees. That was made necessary because of the exorbitant fees that were being charged to the Dis-

trict, and that was money coming directly out of the education system. In fact, before the caps were put in place, attorney's fees represented \$14 million of the DC school budget. Since the caps have been put in place, we have had a figure of \$3.5 million per year average for attorney's fees, and the extra \$10.5 million has been able to go into the services we are seeking to provide for handicapped and special needs children.

Moreover, we have been informed by the District of some of the excessive fees that were being billed before the caps. This is billing the school district for plaintiff's lawyer fees when the plaintiff has been successful. One attorney before the caps individually made \$1.4 million in fees in 1 year suing the District of Columbia schools.

Another law firm billed over \$5 million in a single year to the District of Columbia schools. Submission of a variety of questionable expenses, including flowers, ski trips, and even a trip to New Orleans ostensibly made to scout out private schools far from the District that might be able to accommodate special needs students.

The reason we are trying to put some reasonable caps on these attorney's fees and excessive billings is so the money will go into education. Our amendment has a cap of \$150 an hour. If a lawyer billed 2,000 hours at \$150 an hour, that would be a \$300,000 annual income.

So, we are not saying lawyers should not make a reasonable amount, and we are certainly not subjecting parents to lawyers who cannot make a living. I think \$150 an hour is quite respectable. That is why we have tried to reach out to the other side and do something that is reasonable but not exorbitant.

We are trying to help the District of Columbia schools. We have a letter from the superintendent of schools and the president of the school board requesting us to take this action. They are very concerned that millions of dollars will go into lawyer's fees rather than to improve the services they give. In fact, they are increasing the number of teachers for special needs students. They are increasing the amount of medical equipment for these special needs students, and that is exactly what we want them to do. So I am trying to be helpful to the DC schools. Educators are the ones who can best determine need.

Our amendment also has an out; that if the District itself believes the caps are too low, they have the ability to override this amendment and this act of Congress and increase the fee caps, with the mayor and the school district working together.

I think that takes care of letting the local people have a final decision, doing what they have asked us to do in putting on reasonable caps, as they are trying to do the very difficult job of providing a quality education for all the students of the District of Columbia.